

Comments - Colonel Briggs.

6 February 1947.

Subject: Memo for DCI by Colonel Wright on CIG 23, dated
4 February 1947.

Coordination of Intelligence Production

1. None of Colonel Wright's suggestions for changes to CIG 19 ^{Nat'l Intelligence} _{Regulations} in his memo to DCI of 4 February are objectionable and I recommend concurrence in paragraph 3a, b, and c of his memo. _{Chnd.}

2. Re paragraph 5, ICAPS is now encountering objections to the IAB "acting for the NIA" which seems to support Colonel Wright's point.

It should be borne in mind that including "full authority" in NIA Directives will cause more protracted discussion and a greater number of differences in IAB meetings and consequent slower action in reaching policy decisions. Further, it may be expected that a larger volume of papers will have to be referred to NIA for two reasons:

a. Because such action is requested by IAB, or

b. Because controversial issues prevent IAB agreement

3. I believe immediate consideration should be given to the following course of action by CIG:

a. Drop the fight on NIR for all areas of the world and by the same process as heretofore employed, develop NIR for internal issue to ORE as production directives.

b. Drop any requirement for production within a time limit.

c. Require ICAPS to review the NIR's at least every three months.

d. OCD will issue collection requests to the agencies as necessary to support ORE in its production effort.

Colonel, AC

25X1

4 February 1947

CONFIDENTIAL**MEMORANDUM FOR: The Director of Central Intelligence.**

1. As a result of our Memorandum of 23 January 1947, addressed to General Chamberlin, subject: "National Intelligence Requirements - China", and at the request of General Chamberlin, the undersigned had a lengthy conference with the General on 3 February 1947. At this conference many of the procedures and problems which have tended to slow down the smooth operation of interdepartmental intelligence were discussed. No one was present except General Chamberlin and myself.

2. I feel I was able to explain and justify many of our procedures which have not been whole-heartedly accepted by G-2. On the other hand, I became aware of many things which I feel should be corrected on our side. Although General Chamberlin was prepared to offer further objection to NIR-China I feel that he will now make no further objection to CIG 19 and the proposed NIA Directive to implement NIR-China.

3. With respect to the proposed NIA Directive (based on CIG 19) which will implement NIR-China, attention is invited to the last sentence of our memorandum to General Chamberlin on the same subject. That sentence reads: "Although I believe the detailed implementing directives for the NIR will, when the plan is eventually perfected, insure the most efficient intelligence production, I am withdrawing the implementing directive to NIR-China and shall refer the problem of their implementation to CIG Assistant Director for Collection and Dissemination who will issue such collection requests as may appear necessary." In view of this statement, I suggest that the following changes be made in the proposed NIA Directive for NIR-China:

a. Eliminate the following wording from the last sentence of paragraph 1 of the proposed directive:

"*****for coordinated directives by all agencies*****".

b. Eliminate the following wording from the first sentence of paragraph 3 of the proposed directive:

"*****immediately undertake to coordinate the various intelligence directives based thereon and will*****".

c. Substitute for the words eliminated in b, above, the following wording:

"*****coordinate the various intelligence requests based thereon and will*****".

CONFIDENTIAL

4. All the above ties in with CIG 18 (Coordination of Collection Activities) based on NIA 7 (same subject). There appears to be no objection anywhere to NIA 7. But there does exist strong objections to CIG 18 for two reasons, as follows:

a. CIG 18 contains controversial matters which are not present in NIA 7.

b. CIG 18 is a DIRECTIVE and the opinion still exists in many quarters that, except as specifically directed by an NIA Directive, CIG can coordinate but it cannot direct. *X*

5. Granted that too many individuals and agencies are concerned over the "wording" of a paper, I still feel we are missing a bet if we fail to take cognizance of an existing fact. Noting again that no agency is in a position to object to an NIA Directive I strongly urge consideration of the following recommendations:

I. That proposed NIA Directives be broadened to the extent necessary to provide full authority for CIG action. This will mean that all discussions and objections will be aired at one time and will not be re-opened and repeated in connection with a CIG implementing paper. *7/9 April*

II. That we discontinue the preparation and issue of CIG Directives, providing for the implementation of NIA Directives by means of Requests based on the NIA directive concerned.

(SIGNED) E. K. WRIGHT
Colonel, GSC
Deputy Director

CONFIDENTIAL